

**REMARKS**

Claims 23, 24 and 25 have been cancelled and incorporated into claim 1. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-22, and 26-34 will be active.

In the amendment filed November 28, 2005, applicants intended to cancel claims 23 and 24, add limitations from those claims to claim 1, and argue a point discussed in a telephone interview on October 21, 2005. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the present claims to at least place the claims in better condition for appeal and consider the following remarks. In the telephone interview held on October 21, 2005 regarding the Advisory Action dated October 11, 2005 (i.e., the previous AA), it was noted that the argument on page 11, last paragraph to page 12 line 5 contains a mistake. It states that Collete et al. discloses multilayer films but in fact, it discloses only monolayer films. Examiner Patterson acknowledged the error, but would not change his overall conclusion that Collete et al. makes the invention obvious in view of Heilmann et al. One reason was that Heilmann et al. discloses many polymer types (including 100 % polypropylene) and some of the possible multilayer films would presumably have no yield point, even though Heilmann et al. does not mention that subject. Also, the claims read on 100% polypropylene, while Collete et al. discloses 100 % polypropylene with no yield point. However, a complete obviousness rejection should at least include a reference disclosing a multilayer film (of any kind) without a yield point. Such a reference is not of record.


The Examiner noted that the Heilmann et al. compositions are extremely broad and probably include layer combinations that would have no yield point. But Heilmann et al. does not explain how to select a multilayer film without a yield point if that property were desired. For this reason the combined references do not make out prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Furthermore, Collete et al. is restricted to the use of very special polypropylene polymers. The claims have been amended by adding limitations on the polymer composition which were recited in claims 24 and 25. Such multi-layer films using blends according to the amended claim 1 display superior properties that were not foreseeable to a person skilled in the art in view of the Heilmann and Collete et al. teachings. Accordingly, Applicants request respectfully that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**AUTHORIZATION**

Applicants believe there is no additional fee due in connection with this filing. However, to the extent required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due in connection with this filing to Deposit Account 50-1710 or credit any overpayment to same.

Respectfully submitted,



Gilberto M. Villacorta, PH.D.  
Registration No. 34,038  
Robert W. Hahl, PH.D.  
Registration No. 33,893

Dated: January 12, 2006

Patent Administrator  
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP  
525 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061